

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

WALTER PARKER and
GORDON ROY PARKER
Plaintiffs,

v.

4247 FX, INC., *a Pennsylvania Corporation*;
GARY KERSTEIN, *a Pennsylvania Resident*;
JOYCE PRENTISS, *a Pennsylvania Resident*;
MARLA KLEIN KERSTEIN, *a Pennsylvania*
Resident; ALAN H. KLEIN, *a Pennsylvania*
Resident, in their individual and professional
capacities; FAIRFAX APARTMENTS
ASSOCIATES, *a Pennsylvania Corporation*; and,
JOHN DOES #1-10
Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION
NO. 16-2710

ORDER

AND NOW, this 21st day of June, 2017, it is hereby ORDERED as follows:

- (1) Plaintiff Gordon Roy Parker's Motion for Severance (Doc. No. 32) is DENIED;¹
- (2) Defendant Fairfax Apartments Associates' Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. No. 33) is DENIED;²
- (3) Plaintiff Gordon Roy Parker's Motion to Alter Judgment (Doc. No. 35) is

¹ In accordance with this Court's Memorandum and Order dated May 12, 2017 (Doc. Nos. 25 & 26), Plaintiff Gordon Roy Parker has no claims remaining that would confer federal jurisdiction. Accordingly, his current request is rendered moot.

² In its Memorandum and Order dated May 12, 2017 (Doc. Nos. 25 & 26), this Court specifically opined that there were insufficient facts regarding the rent abatement, that would enable the court to determine whether or not Plaintiff Walter Parker could sustain a claim under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Inasmuch as said claim is the only one remaining that could potentially confer jurisdiction upon this Court, expedited discovery was ordered regarding this very limited issue. This jurisdictional discovery is necessary in order for Plaintiff Walter Parker to potentially file the Amended Complaint referenced in the court's prior Order.

DENIED; and,³

- (4) The deadline set forth in Paragraph 3 of this Court's Order dated May 22, 2017 (Doc. No. 29) shall be extended to **July 31, 2017**.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ C. Darnell Jones, II J.

³ For the reasons set forth in this Court's Memorandum and Order dated May 12, 2017 (Doc. Nos. 25 & 26), Plaintiff Gordon Roy Parker's arguments in support of altering judgment or permitting amendment are wholly without merit. With specific regard to said Plaintiff's argument that as a pro se litigant, he should be permitted an opportunity to amend, this Court notes that he was already given an opportunity to amend (Doc. No. 9). In light of the court's findings, any further attempt would be futile. Additionally, although technically proceeding under "pro se" status, Plaintiff Gordon Roy Parker is no stranger to litigation in this District, where he has commenced suit and represented himself on numerous occasions. *See Parker v. City House Hostels, et al.*, Civ. No. 17-2540 (E.D. Pa. June 7, 2017); *Parker v. PayPal, Inc.*, Civ. No. 15-6065 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 10, 2015) (voluntarily dismissing suit); *Parker v. Kelly Servs., Inc.*, Civ. No. 15-3337 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 23, 2015) (granting Defendants' motion to dismiss); *Parker v. Social Sec. Admin.*, Civ. No. 15-3453 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 21, 2015) (granting defendant's motion to dismiss); *Parker v. Goldhagen*, Civ. No. 15-3304 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 15, 2015) (voluntarily dismissing suit); *Parker v. Viacom Int'l, Inc.*, Civ. No. 08-3630 (E.D. Pa. Mar. 16, 2009) (granting Defendant's motion to dismiss); *Parker v. Yahoo!, Inc.*, Civ. No. 07-2757 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 4, 2009) (dismissing claims); *Parker v. Sloan*, Civ. No. 08-0829 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 2, 2009) (dismissing Complaint with prejudice); *Parker v. Trustees of the Univ. of Penn.*, Civ. No. 05-4874 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 2, 2008) (granting Defendant's motion for summary judgment); *Parker v. Learn the Skills Corp.*, Civ. No. 05-2752 (E.D. Pa. Mar. 23, 2006) (granting Defendants' motion to dismiss); *Parker v. Google, Inc.*, Civ. No. 04-3918 (E.D. Pa. Mar. 10, 2006) (dismissing Complaint with prejudice); *Parker v. Comcast High-Speed Internet*, Misc. No. 05-0157 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 27, 2005) (denying request for Rule 27 testimony); *Parker v. Learn the Skills Corp.*, Civ. No. 03-6936 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 25, 2004) (dismissing Complaint); *Parker v. Univ. of Penn.*, Civ. No. 02-0567 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 10, 2004) (granting Defendant's motion for summary judgment and dismissing case with prejudice); *Parker v. Doe*, Civ. No. 02-7215 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 25, 2003) (dismissing suit for failure to serve Defendants).